UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/988,831	11/20/2001	Yuval Shachar	Q58965	9173

38137   7590   10/05/2009
ABELMAN, FRAYNE & SCHWAB
666 THIRD AVENUE, 10TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10017

EXAMINER
FORD, GRANT M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2442	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/05/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 November 2001</u>.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-561</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-561</u> is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>18 October 2005</u> is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)
1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/8/2003,3/8/2007,5/7/2009</u> .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1.   Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2.   The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Substantially all claimed subject matter is missing from the instant drawings. Therefore, all claimed limitations not currently shown in the drawings must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

        Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure

is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet,

and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate

changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for

consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering

of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an

application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New

Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner,

the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next

Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4.   Claims 1-18, 20-24, 54-91, 96-115, 117-118, 122-135, 141-158, 160-164, 195-

232, 237-256, 258-259, 263-277, 283-300, 302-306, 337-374, 379-398, 400-401, 405-

419, 425-437, 439-443, 474-511, 516-535, 537-538, and 542-556 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ivory (US 6,757,727).

Examiner note – the instant rejection begins with the apparatus claim 141, the

rejection of claims 1-140 are addressed below.

a.   As per claim 141, Ivory discloses an apparatus for controlling a network

system, comprising:

an interface coupled to a network of said network system (Col. 2 lines 53-

61, Col. 3 lines 4-14 and 32-35, Col. 5 lines 33-39); and

a processor that processes a first event that occurs in said network

system, wherein said first event is defined via software and wherein said processor

controls at least a portion of said network system when said first event is processed and

wherein said first event corresponds to information transmitted over said network

system in at least one of application, presentation, session, transport, and network

layers of a communication model (Col. 7 line 64 through Col. 8 line 11).

b.   As per claims 142-146, Ivory discloses wherein said first event is defined

in any user selected layer of said communication model (Col. 2 lines 46-58, Col. 3 lines

4-14, Col. 5 lines 33-39).

c.   As per claim 147, Ivory discloses wherein said processor processes a

second event that is defined via said software, and wherein said second event is

defined at least partially with said first event (Col. 9 lines 1-15).

d.   As per claim 148, Ivory discloses wherein said processor processes a

second event that is defined via said software, and wherein said first event is at least

partially defined with said second event (Figure 5, Col. 7 lines 33-42).

e.   As per claim 149, Ivory discloses wherein said processor performs a

matching operation that is defined via said software, wherein said matching operation

detects an occurrence of a variable in information transmitted over said network and

wherein said variable is identified in said matching operation, and wherein said first

event is at least partially defined with said matching operation (Col. 7 lines 7-25 and 43-

55).

f.   As per claim 150, Ivory discloses wherein said matching operation causes

said processor to identify whether or not a series of data within a process flow

corresponds to said variable (Col. 7 lines 7-25, Col. 8 lines 44-56).

g.   As per claim 151, Ivory discloses wherein said matching operation causes

said processor to identify whether or not an occurrence of a predefined event

corresponds to said variable, and wherein said matching operation causes said

processor to determine that said predefined event has occurred when said predefined

event corresponds to said variable (Col. 7 lines 7-25, Col. 8 lines 44-56).

h.   As per claim 152, Ivory discloses wherein said processor repeatedly

performing said matching operation within a process flow (Col. 8 lines 36-43).

i.   As per claim 153, Ivory discloses wherein said processor discontinues

performance of said matching operation when said occurrence of said variable is

detected (Col. 3 lines 49-63 – note process ends when root cause is detected).

j.   As per claim 154, Ivory discloses wherein said processor updates whether

or not said matching operation is a success or a failure each time said matching

operation is performed, wherein processor deems said matching operation to be said

success when said matching operation detects said occurrence of said variable, and

wherein said processor deems said matching operation to be said failure when said

matching operation does not detect said occurrence of said variable (Col.3 lines 49-63 –

note adaptive filtering expands until locating root cause).

k.   As per claim 155, Ivory discloses wherein said processor performs said

matching operation on a plurality of process flows (Col. 7 line 64 through Col. 8 line 11).

l.   As per claim 156, Ivory discloses wherein said matching operation defines

a specified location within information transmitted on said network system and wherein

said processor deems said matching operation to be successful only if said occurrence

of said variable in said information is detected after said specified location (Col 9 lines

51-65 – see adaptive filter 406 using endpoint address for probing).

m.   As per claim 157, Ivory discloses wherein said matching operation defines

a specified location within information transmitted on said network system and wherein

said processor deems said matching operation to be successful only if said occurrence

of said variable in said information is detected at said specified location (Col 9 lines 51-

65).

n.   As per claim 158, Ivory discloses wherein said processor performs an

otherwise operation, wherein said otherwise operation is defined via software, wherein

said otherwise operation is performed by said processor when said matching operation

is a failure, and wherein said first event is at least partially defined with said otherwise

operation (Col. 9 lines 1-15).

o.   As per claim 160, Ivory discloses wherein said processor performs said otherwise operation immediately after said matching operation when said matching operation is said failure (Col. 9 lines 1-15).

p.   As per claim 161, Ivory discloses wherein said processor performs a concurrent operation that is defined via said software, wherein said concurrent operation comprises a first group of operations comprising at least a first operation and a second operation that are concurrently performed by said processor, and wherein said first event is at least partially defined with said concurrent operation (Col. 9 lines 1-43).

q.   As per claim 162, Ivory discloses wherein said processor ceases performing all unsuccessful operations of said first group of operations within said concurrent operation when one operation of said first group of operations is a success (Col. 3 lines 49-63 – note process ends when root cause is detected).

r.   As per claim 163, Ivory discloses wherein said processor performs a third operation defined via said software when all of said first group of operations are not a success, and wherein said first event is at least partially defined with said third operation (Col. 9 lines 16-29 – note user selective configuration of later analysis determinations based on results of previous analysis).

s.   As per claim 164, Ivory discloses wherein the matching operation is defined with a modifier that identifies a specific location in said information where said occurrence of said variable is to be detected by said processor (Col 9 lines 51-65).

t.   As per claim 195, Ivory discloses wherein said match operation comprises a dedicated instruction, wherein said dedicated instruction is executed by said

processor when said match operation is a success, and wherein said first event

completes execution when said dedicated instruction is executed by said processor

(Col. 7 lines 7-25 and 43-55).

u.   As per claim 196, Ivory discloses wherein the dedicated instruction

indicates a successful completion of said first event (Col.3 lines 49-63).

v.   As per claim 197, Ivory discloses wherein said match operation comprises

a dedicated instruction, wherein said dedicated instruction is executed by said

processor when said match operation is unsuccessful, and wherein said first event

completes execution when said dedicated instruction is executed by said processor

(Col.3 lines 49-63).

w.   As per claim 198, Ivory discloses wherein the dedicated instruction

indicates an unsuccessful completion of said first event (Col. 3 lines 49-63).

x.   As per claim 199, Ivory discloses wherein said processor generates

successful completion data when said first event is successfully completed, and wherein

at least a second event defined via software instructs said processor to utilize said

successful completion data to determine whether or not said first event has been

successfully completed (Col.3 lines 49-63, Col. 7 lines 7-25 and 43-55).

y.   As per claim 200, Ivory discloses wherein said processor generates

unsuccessful completion data when said first event is not successfully completed, and

wherein at least a second event defined via software instructs said processor to utilize

said unsuccessful completion data to determine whether or not said first event has been

successfully completed (Col.3 lines 49-63, Col. 7 lines 7-25 and 43-55).

z.   As per claim 201, Ivory discloses wherein a variable is defined as at least part of said first event, wherein said first event instructs said processor to determine an alias for said variable, and wherein said variable is capable of being referenced via said alias (Col. 6 line 60 through Col. 7 line 25 – note "filter mask").

aa.   As per claim 202, Ivory discloses wherein said processor processes a second event, wherein a variable reference to said alias is part of said second event and wherein said second event instructs said processor to utilize said variable via said variable reference (Figure 5, Col. 7 lines 33-42).

bb.   As per claim 203, Ivory discloses wherein said variable has a plurality of subparts, and wherein said alias is defined as a subset of said variable containing less than all of said subparts such that said variable reference corresponds to only said subset (Col. 6 line 60 through Col. 7 line 25).

cc.   As per claim 204, Ivory discloses wherein said subparts are subfields of said variable (Col. 6 line 60 through Col. 7 line 25).

dd.   As per claim 205, Ivory discloses wherein a variable is defined as at least part of said first event, wherein said processor constrains said variable to be restricted to at least a particular value by referring to said variable in a particular operation and setting said variable equal to said at least said particular value in said particular operation, and wherein said processor determines that said particular operation is a success if said variable equals said at least said particular value (Col.3 lines 49-63, Col. 6 line 60 through Col. 7 line 25).

ee.   As per claims 206-207, Ivory discloses wherein said particular operation is a match operation or an event operation (Col. 7 lines 7-25 and 43-55, Col. 7 line 64 through Col. 8 line 11).

ff.   As per claim 208, Ivory discloses wherein a variable is defined as at least part of said first event, wherein said processor constrains said variable to be restricted to at least a particular value by referring to said variable in a particular operation and setting said variable equal to said at least said particular value in said particular operation, and wherein said processor determines that said particular operation is a success if said variable does not equal said at least said particular value (Col.3 lines 49-63, Col. 6 line 60 through Col. 7 line 25).

gg.   As per claims 209-210, Ivory discloses wherein said particular operation is a match operation or an event operation (Col. 7 lines 7-25 and 43-55, Col. 7 line 64 through Col. 8 line 11).

hh.   As per claim 211, Ivory discloses wherein a variable is defined as at least part of said first event, wherein said processor constrains said variable to be restricted to at least a particular range of values by referring to said variable in a particular operation and setting said variable equal to said at least said particular range in said particular operation, and wherein said processor determines that said particular operation is a success if said variable is within said particular range (Col.3 lines 49-63, Col. 6 line 60 through Col. 7 line 25).

ii.   As per claims 212-213, Ivory discloses wherein said particular operation is a match operation or an event operation (Col. 7 lines 7-25 and 43-55, Col. 7 line 64 through Col. 8 line 11).

jj.   As per claim 214, Ivory discloses wherein a variable is defined as at least part of said first event, wherein said processor constrains said variable to be restricted to at least a particular range of values by referring to said variable in a particular operation and setting said variable equal to said at least said particular range in said particular operation, and wherein said particular operation is a success if said variable is not within said particular range (Col.3 lines 49-63, Col. 6 line 60 through Col. 7 line 25).

kk.   As per claims 215-216, Ivory discloses wherein said particular operation is a match operation or an event operation (Col. 7 lines 7-25 and 43-55, Col. 7 line 64 through Col. 8 line 11).

ll.   As per claim 217, Ivory discloses wherein said alias is defined as a particular subfield of said variable, wherein said processor constrains said variable to be restricted to at least a particular value by referring to said variable reference in a particular operation and setting said variable reference equal to said at least said particular value in said particular operation, and wherein said processor determines that said particular operation is a success if said variable reference equals said particular value (Col.3 lines 49-63, Col. 6 line 60 through Col. 7 line 25).

mm.   As per claims 218-219, Ivory discloses wherein said particular operation is a match operation or an event operation (Col. 7 lines 7-25 and 43-55, Col. 7 line 64 through Col. 8 line 11).

nn.   As per claim 220, Ivory discloses wherein said alias is defined as a
particular subfield of said variable, wherein said processor constrains said variable to be
restricted to at least a particular value by referring to said variable reference in a
particular operation and setting said variable reference equal to said at least said
particular value in said particular operation, and wherein said processor determines that
said particular operation is a success if said variable reference does not equal said
particular value (Col.3 lines 49-63, Col. 6 line 60 through Col. 7 line 25).

oo.   As per claims 221-222, Ivory discloses wherein said particular operation is
a match operation or an event operation (Col. 7 lines 7-25 and 43-55, Col. 7 line 64
through Col. 8 line 11).

pp.   As per claim 223, Ivory discloses wherein said alias is defined as a
particular subfield of said variable, wherein said processor constrains said variable to be
restricted to at least a particular range of values by referring to said variable reference in
a particular operation and setting said variable reference equal to said at least said
particular range in said particular operation, and wherein said processor determines that
said particular operation is a success if said variable reference is within said particular
range (Col.3 lines 49-63, Col. 6 line 60 through Col. 7 line 25).

qq.   As per claims 224-225, Ivory discloses wherein said particular operation is
a match operation or an event operation (Col. 7 lines 7-25 and 43-55, Col. 7 line 64
through Col. 8 line 11).

rr.   As per claim 226, Ivory discloses wherein said alias is defined as a
particular subfield of said variable, wherein said processor constrains said variable to be

restricted to at least a particular range of values by referring to said variable reference in

a particular operation and setting said variable reference equal to said at least said

particular range in said particular operation, and wherein said processor determines that

said particular operation is a success if said variable reference is not within said

particular range (Col.3 lines 49-63, Col. 6 line 60 through Col. 7 line 25).

ss.   As per claims 227-228, Ivory discloses wherein said particular operation is

a match operation or an event operation (Col. 7 lines 7-25 and 43-55, Col. 7 line 64

through Col. 8 line 11).

tt.   As per claims 229-232, Ivory discloses wherein said first event is

described in at least a first layer of said communication model, wherein said first layer is

one of said application layer, said presentation layer, said session layer, said transport

layer, and said network layer of said communication model, wherein said first event is

transformed into actions in said first layer of said communication model, and wherein

said first event is transformed into actions in a second layer of said communication

model, wherein said second layer is lower in said communication model than said first

layer (Col. 2 lines 46-58, Col. 3 lines 4-14, Col. 5 lines 33-39, Col. 9 lines 16-65).

uu.   As per claims 1-18, 20-24, and 54-91, the claims are directed to method

claims corresponding to the apparatus claims of rejected claims 141-158, 160-164, and

195-232 and are thus rejected under the same rationale as outlined above.

vv.   As per claims 96-115, 117-118, 122-132, the claims are directed to

method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims of rejected claims 142-146,149-

158, 160, 205-216 and 229-230 and are thus rejected under the same rationale as outlined above.

ww.   As per claims 133-135, the claims are directed to method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims of rejected claims 161-163 and are thus rejected under the same rationale as outlined above.

xx.   As per claims 237-256, 258-259, and 263-274 are apparatus claims directed to the apparatus claims of rejected claims 142-146, 149-158, 160, 205-216 and 229-230 are thus rejected under the same rationale as outlined above.

yy.   As per claims 275-277, the claims are directed to apparatus claims corresponding to the apparatus claims of rejected claims 161-163 and are thus rejected under the same rationale as outlined above.

zz.   As per claims 283-300, 302-306, and 337-374, the claims are directed to computer implemented method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims of rejected claims 141-158, 160-164, and 195-232 and are thus rejected under the same rationale as outlined above.

a1.   As per claims 379-398, 400-401, and 405-416, the claims are directed to computer implemented method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims of rejected claims 142-146,149-158, 160, 205-216 and 229-230 and are thus rejected under the same rationale as outlined above.

b1.   As per claims 417-419, the claims are directed to computer-implemented method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims of rejected claims 161-163 and are thus rejected under the same rationale as outlined above.

c1.   As per claims 425-437, 439-443, and 474-511 the claims are directed to

computer-implemented method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims of

rejected claims 141-158, 160-164, and 195-232 and are thus rejected under the same

rationale as outlined above.

d1.   As per claims 516-535, 537-538, and 542-553, the claims are directed to

computer-implemented method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims of

rejected claims 142-146,149-158, 160, 205-216 and 229-230 and are thus rejected

under the same rationale as outlined above.

e1.   As per claims 554-556, the claims are directed to computer-implemented

method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims of rejected claims 161-163 and

are thus rejected under the same rationale as outlined above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 19, 92-95, 136-140, 159, 233-236, 278-282, 301, 375-378, 420-424, 438,

512-515, and 557-561 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Ivory in view of Greene et al. (US 2002/0165727), hereinafter referred to as Greene.

a.   As per claim 159, Ivory discloses the invention substantially as claimed above. However, the prior art of Ivory fails to explicitly disclose wherein said processor performs a throw operation that is defined via software and that identifies a resync operation corresponding to said throw operation, wherein said throw operation causes said processor to perform a specific operation corresponding to said resync operation.

Greene teaches wherein said processor performs a throw operation that is defined via software and that identifies a resync operation corresponding to said throw operation, wherein said throw operation causes said processor to perform a specific operation corresponding to said resync operation (Para. 0353). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of an exception identifying a resync operation with the prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of capturing a StaleData exception and performing re-synchronizing corresponding to the exception (Para. 0353).

b.   As per claim 233, Ivory discloses the invention substantially as claimed above. However, the prior art of Ivory fails to explicitly disclose wherein said processor performs a first throw operation, wherein said first throw operation identifies a first exception name corresponding to said first throw instruction, wherein said first event at least partially with said first throw instruction, and wherein said processor performs a resynchronization operation.

Greene teaches wherein said processor performs a first throw operation, wherein said first throw operation identifies a first exception name corresponding to said

first throw instruction, wherein said first event at least partially with said first throw

instruction, and wherein said processor performs a resynchronization operation (Para.

0353). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate the use of an exception identifying a resync

operation with the prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so

for the purpose of capturing a StaleData exception and performing re-synchronizing

corresponding to the exception (Para. 0353).

c.   As per claim 234, Ivory discloses the invention substantially as claimed

above. However, the prior art of Ivory fails to explicitly disclose wherein said processor

performs a first throw operation.

Greene teaches wherein said processor resynchronizes to an instruction

immediately following said resynchronization operation when said first throw operation

is performed (Para. 0353, 0398). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill

in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of an exception

identifying a resync operation with the prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art

would have done so for the purpose of capturing a StaleData exception and performing

re-synchronizing corresponding to the exception (Para. 0353).

d.   As per claim 235, Ivory discloses the invention substantially as claimed

above. However, the prior art of Ivory fails to explicitly disclose wherein said processor

performs a first throw operation, wherein said first throw operation identifies a first

exception name corresponding to said first throw instruction, wherein said first event at

least partially with said first throw instruction, and wherein said processor performs a resynchronization operation.

Greene teaches wherein said resynchronization operation identifies said first exception name (Para. 0353, 0398). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of an exception identifying a resync operation with the prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of capturing a StaleData exception and performing re-synchronizing corresponding to the exception (Para. 0353).

e.   As per claim 236, Ivory discloses the invention substantially as claimed above. However, the prior art of Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of a first and second throw operation.

Greene teaches wherein said processor performs a second throw operation, wherein said second throw operation identifies a second exception name corresponding to said second throw instruction, wherein said resynchronization operation identifies said first exception name and said second exception name, wherein said processor resynchronizes to an instruction immediately following said resynchronization operation when said first throw operation is performed based on said first exception name, and wherein said processor resynchronizes to said instruction immediately following said resynchronization operation when said second throw operation is performed based on said second exception name (Para. 0353, 0398). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of an exception identifying a resync operation with the

prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of capturing a StaleData exception and performing re-synchronizing corresponding to the exception (Para. 0353).

f.   As per claims 19 and 92-95, the claims are directed to method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims of rejected claims 159 and 233-236 and are thus rejected under the same rationale as outlined above.

g.   As per claims 136-140, the claims are directed to method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims of rejected claims 159 and 233-236 and are thus rejected under the same rationale as outlined above.

h.   As per claims 278-282, the claims are directed to apparatus claims corresponding to the apparatus claims of rejected claims 159 and 233-236 and are thus rejected under the same rationale as outlined above.

i.   As per claims 301 and 375-378, the claims are directed to computer implemented method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims of rejected claims 159 and 233-236 and are thus rejected under the same rationale as outlined above.

j.   As per claims 420-424, the claims are directed to computer-implemented method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims of rejected claims 159 and 233-236 and are thus rejected under the same rationale as outlined above.

k.   As per claims 438 and 512-515, the claims are directed to computer implemented method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims of rejected claims 159 and 233-236 and are thus rejected under the same rationale as outlined above.

I.   As per claims 557-561, the claims are directed to computer-implemented

method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims of rejected claims 159 and 233-

236 and are thus rejected under the same rationale as outlined above.

7.   Claims 25, 116-121, 165, 257, 260-262, 307, 399, 402-404, 444, 536, and 539-

541 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ivory in view of

Hoffman (US 6,940,814).

a.   As per claim 165, Ivory discloses the invention substantially as claimed

above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of identifying offsets for use in

packet inspection.

Hoffman teaches wherein said modifier identifies at least one of (1) a

starting offset of an Internet protocol header in a current datagram transmitted on said

network system, (2) a starting offset of a payload in a current datagram transmitted on

said network system, (3) a starting offset of a transport header in a current datagram

transmitted on said network system, and (4) a starting offset of a first payload in a series

of concatenated payloads in a current process flow transmitted on said network system

(Col. 9 lines 21-38, Col. 12 lines 42-58). It would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of

identifying packet data offsets with the prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art

would have done so for the purpose of providing encapsulation logic for use with class

filters for identifying locations of relevant information (Col 12 lines 42-58).

b.   As per claim 25, the claim is directed to a method claim corresponding to the apparatus claim of rejected claim 165 and is thus rejected under the same rationale as outlined above.

c.   As per claims 116 and 119, the claims are directed to method claims corresponding to the apparatus claim of rejected claim 165 and are thus rejected under the same rationale as outlined above.

d.   As per claims 120-121, Ivory discloses a matching operation to determine whether or not said variable exists and has at least said certain value at or after a particular location as shown at claim 157 above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of identifying offsets for use in packet inspection.

Hoffman teaches identifying offsets for use in packet inspection (Col. 9 lines 21-38, Col. 12 lines 42-58). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of identifying packet data offsets with the prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of providing encapsulation logic for use with class filters for identifying locations of relevant information (Col 12 lines 42-58).

e.   As per claims 257 and 260, the claims are directed to apparatus claims corresponding to the apparatus claim of rejected claim 165 and are thus rejected under the same rationale as outlined above.

f.   As per claims 261-262, Ivory discloses a matching operation to determine whether or not said variable exists and has at least said certain value at or after a

particular location as shown at claim 157 above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly

disclose the use of identifying offsets for use in packet inspection.

Hoffman teaches identifying offsets for use in packet inspection (Col. 9

lines 21-38, Col. 12 lines 42-58). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill

in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of identifying packet

data offsets with the prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so

for the purpose of providing encapsulation logic for use with class filters for identifying

locations of relevant information (Col 12 lines 42-58).

g.   As per claim 307, the claim is directed to a method claim corresponding to

the apparatus claim of rejected claim 165 and is thus rejected under the same rationale

as outlined above.

h.   As per claims 399 and 402, the claims are directed to computer

implemented method claims corresponding to the apparatus claim of rejected claim 165

and are thus rejected under the same rationale as outlined above.

i.   As per claims 403-404, Ivory discloses a matching operation to determine

whether or not said variable exists and has at least said certain value at or after a

particular location as shown at claim 157 above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly

disclose the use of identifying offsets for use in packet inspection.

Hoffman teaches identifying offsets for use in packet inspection (Col. 9

lines 21-38, Col. 12 lines 42-58). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill

in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of identifying packet

data offsets with the prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so

for the purpose of providing encapsulation logic for use with class filters for identifying

locations of relevant information (Col 12 lines 42-58).

j.   As per claim 444, the claim is directed to a computer implemented method

claim corresponding to the apparatus claim of rejected claim 165 and is thus rejected

under the same rationale as outlined above.

k.   As per claims 536 and 539, the claims are directed to computer

implemented method claims corresponding to the apparatus claim of rejected claim 165

and are thus rejected under the same rationale as outlined above.

l.   As per claims 540-541, Ivory discloses a matching operation to determine

whether or not said variable exists and has at least said certain value at or after a

particular location as shown at claim 157 above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly

disclose the use of identifying offsets for use in packet inspection.

Hoffman teaches identifying offsets for use in packet inspection (Col. 9

lines 21-38, Col. 12 lines 42-58). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill

in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of identifying packet

data offsets with the prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so

for the purpose of providing encapsulation logic for use with class filters for identifying

locations of relevant information (Col 12 lines 42-58).

8.   Claims 26-53, 166-194, 308-336, and 445-473 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Ivory in view of Farrell et al. (US 6,751,663),

hereinafter referred to as Farrell.

a.   As per claim 166, Ivory discloses the invention substantially as claimed

above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of a timer.

Farrell teaches wherein a timer is defined via said software, and wherein

said timer causes said processor to count time (Col. 6 lines 12-22, Col. 17 lines 36-45,

Col. 21 lines 24-35, Col. 28 lines 35-45). It would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a

timer with the prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for

the purpose of determining timing for status reports (Col. 28 lines 35-55).

b.   As per claim 167, Ivory and Farrell teach the invention substantially as

claimed above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of a timer.

Farrell teaches wherein said timer is capable of instructing said processor

to count said time in a selected time unit, wherein said selected time unit is selected

from one of a plurality of available predefined time units, and wherein said timer is

defined to instruct said processor to count said time in said selected time unit (Col. 21

lines 24-35, Col. 28 lines 35-60). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill

in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a timer with the

prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of

determining timing for status reports (Col. 28 lines 35-55).

c.   As per claim 168, Ivory and Farrell teach the invention substantially as claimed above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of a timer.

Farrell teaches wherein one of said predefined time units comprises at least one of milliseconds and seconds (Col. 21 lines 24-35). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a timer with the prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of determining timing for status reports (Col. 28 lines 35-55).

d.   As per claim 169, Ivory and Farrell teach the invention substantially as claimed above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of a timer.

Farrell teaches wherein said processor decrements a current count value of said timer until said current count value equals a predefined count value, and wherein, when said current count value equals said predefined count value, said processor ceases counting and generates an indication that said current count value equals said predefined count value (Col. 28 lines 50-55). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a timer with the prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of determining timing for status reports (Col. 28 lines 35-55).

e.   As per claim 170, Ivory and Farrell teach the invention substantially as claimed above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of a timer.

Farrell teaches wherein said processor increments a current count value of said timer until said current count value equals a predefined count value, and wherein, when said current count value equals said predefined count value, said

processor ceases counting and generates an indication that said current count value

equals said predefined count value (Col. 17 lines 36-45, Col. 21 lines 24-35, Col. 28

lines 35-60). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a timer with the prior art of Ivory.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of determining timing

for status reports (Col. 28 lines 35-55).

      f.   As per claim 171, Ivory and Farrell teach the invention substantially as

claimed above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of a timer.

      Farrell teaches wherein said timer is capable instructing said processor to

count said time in a selected direction, wherein said selected direction is selected from

a first direction in which a count value of said timer is incremented and a second

direction in which said count value is decremented, and wherein said timer instructs

said processor to count said time in said selected direction (Col. 21 lines 24-35, Col. 28

lines 35-60). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a timer with the prior art of Ivory.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of determining timing

for status reports (Col. 28 lines 35-55).

      g.   As per claim 172, Ivory and Farrell teach the invention substantially as

claimed above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of a timer.

      Farrell teaches wherein, when said count value equals a predefined count

value, said processor ceases counting and generates an indication that said count value

equals said predefined count value (Col. 28 lines 35-60). It would have been obvious to

one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a timer with the prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of determining timing for status reports (Col. 28 lines 35-55).

h.   As per claim 173, Ivory and Farrell teach the invention substantially as claimed above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of a timer.

Farrell teaches wherein said processor performs a timer start operation that is defined via said software and that instructs said processor to start counting in accordance with said timer (Col. 17 lines 36-45, Col. 21 lines 24-35, Col. 28 lines 35-60). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a timer with the prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of determining timing for status reports (Col. 28 lines 35-55).

i.   As per claim 174, Ivory and Farrell teach the invention substantially as claimed above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of a timer.

Farrell teaches wherein said processor performs a timer stop operation that is defined via said software and that instructs said processor to stop counting (Col. 28 lines 35-60). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a timer with the prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of determining timing for status reports (Col. 28 lines 35-55).

j.   As per claim 175, Ivory and Farrell teach the invention substantially as claimed above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of a timer.

Farrell teaches wherein said processor performs a timer pause operation that is defined via said software and that instructs said processor to suspend counting (Col. 17 lines 36-45, Col. 21 lines 24-35, Col. 28 lines 35-60). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a timer with the prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of determining timing for status reports (Col. 28 lines 35-55).

k.   As per claim 176, Ivory and Farrell teach the invention substantially as claimed above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of a timer.

Farrell teaches wherein said processor performs a timer resume operation that is defined via software and that instructs said processor to resume counting after said processor has suspended counting (Col. 17 lines 36-45, Col. 21 lines 24-35, Col. 28 lines 35-60). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a timer with the prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of determining timing for status reports (Col. 28 lines 35-55).

l.   As per claim 177, Ivory and Farrell teach the invention substantially as claimed above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of a meter.

Farrell teaches wherein a meter is defined via said software, and wherein said meter instructs said processor to count quantities of a selected quantity unit (Col. 6 lines 12-22). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a meter for counting quantities of

a selected unit with the prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done

so for the purpose of providing counters based on e.g., packets in, packets out, bytes in,

bytes out, and so on (Col. 6 lines 12-22).

  m. As per claim 178, Ivory and Farrell teach the invention substantially as

claimed above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of a meter using

predetermined quantity units.

    Farrell teaches wherein said selected quantity unit is selected from one of

a plurality of available predefined quantity units (Col. 6 lines 12-22). It would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

incorporate the use of a meter for counting quantities of a selected unit with the prior art

of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of providing

counters based on e.g., packets in, packets out, bytes in, bytes out, and so on (Col. 6

lines 12-22).

  n. As per claim 179, Ivory and Farrell teach the invention substantially as

claimed above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of a meter using

predetermined quantity units.

    Farrell teaches wherein one of said predefined quantity units comprises at

least one of bits of data and bytes of data (Col. 6 lines 12-22). It would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

incorporate the use of a meter for counting quantities of a selected unit with the prior art

of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of providing

counters based on e.g., packets in, packets out, bytes in, bytes out, and so on (Col. 6

lines 12-22).

o.   As per claim 180-182, Ivory and Farrell teach the invention substantially

as claimed above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of a meter using

predetermined quantity units comprising events, packets, and process flows.

Farrell teaches disclose the use of a meter using predetermined quantity

units comprising events, packets, and process flows (Col. 6 lines 12-22). It would have

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to incorporate the use of a meter for counting quantities of a selected unit with the prior

art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of

providing counters based on e.g., events, packets in, packets out, bytes in, bytes out,

and so on (Col. 6 lines 12-22).

p.   As per claim 183, Ivory and Farrell teach the invention substantially as

claimed above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of a meter using

predetermined quantity units.

Farrell teaches wherein said meter instructs said processor to count said

quantities of said selected quantity unit in a plurality of process flows (Col. 6 lines 12-

22). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate the use of a meter for counting quantities of a

selected unit with the prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done

so for the purpose of providing counters based on e.g., packets in, packets out, bytes in,

bytes out, and so on (Col. 6 lines 12-22).

q.   As per claim 184, Ivory and Farrell teach the invention substantially as claimed above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of a meter.

Farrell teaches wherein said meter instructs said processor to decrement a current count value of said meter until said current count value equals a predefined count value, and wherein, when said current count value equals said predefined count value, said processor ceases counting and generates an indication that said current count value equals said predefined count value (Col. 6 lines 12-22, Col. 17 lines 36-45, Col. 21 lines 24-35, Col. 28 lines 35-60). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a meter for counting quantities of a selected unit with the prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of providing counters based on e.g., packets in, packets out, bytes in, bytes out, and so on (Col. 6 lines 12-22).

r.   As per claim 185, Ivory and Farrell teach the invention substantially as claimed above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of a meter.

Farrell teaches wherein said meter instructs said processor to increment a current count value until said current count value of said meter equals a predefined count value, and wherein, when said current count value equals said predefined count value, said processor ceases counting and generates an indication that said current count value equals said predefined count value (Col. 6 lines 12-22, Col. 17 lines 36-45, Col. 21 lines 24-35, Col. 28 lines 35-60). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a meter for counting quantities of a selected unit with the prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary

skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of providing counters based on e.g.,

packets in, packets out, bytes in, bytes out, and so on (Col. 6 lines 12-22).

s.   As per claim 186, Ivory and Farrell teach the invention substantially as

claimed above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of a meter.

Farrell teaches wherein said meter is capable of instructing said processor

to count said quantities in a selected direction, wherein said selected direction is

selected from a first direction in which a count value of said meter is incremented and a

second direction in which said count value is decremented, and wherein said meter

instructs said processor to count said quantities in said selected direction (Col. 21 lines

24-35, Col. 28 lines 35-60). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a meter for counting

quantities of a selected unit with the prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art

would have done so for the purpose of providing counters based on e.g., packets in,

packets out, bytes in, bytes out, and so on (Col. 6 lines 12-22).

t.   As per claim 187, Ivory and Farrell teach the invention substantially as

claimed above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of a meter.

Farrell teaches wherein, when said count value equals a predefined count

value, said processor ceases counting and generates an indication that said count value

equals said predefined count value (Col. 6 lines 12-22, Col. 28 lines 35-60). It would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to incorporate the use of a meter for counting quantities of a selected unit with the

prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of

providing counters based on e.g., packets in, packets out, bytes in, bytes out, and so on

(Col. 6 lines 12-22).

s.   As per claim 188, Ivory and Farrell teach the invention substantially as

claimed above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of a meter.

Farrell teaches wherein said processor performs a meter start operation

that is defined via said software and that instructs said processor to start counting in

accordance with said meter (Col. 6 lines 12-22, Col. 28 lines 35-60). It would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

incorporate the use of a meter for counting quantities of a selected unit with the prior art

of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of providing

counters based on e.g., packets in, packets out, bytes in, bytes out, and so on (Col. 6

lines 12-22).

t.   As per claim 189, Ivory and Farrell teach the invention substantially as

claimed above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of a meter.

Farrell teaches wherein said processor performs a meter stop operation

that is defined via said software and that instructs said processor to stop counting (Col.

6 lines 12-22, Col. 28 lines 35-60). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a meter for

counting quantities of a selected unit with the prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in

the art would have done so for the purpose of providing counters based on e.g., packets

in, packets out, bytes in, bytes out, and so on (Col. 6 lines 12-22).

u.   As per claim 190, Ivory and Farrell teach the invention substantially as

claimed above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of a meter.

Farrell teaches wherein said processor performs a meter pause operation

that is defined via said software and that instructs said processor to suspend counting

(Col. 6 lines 12-22, Col. 28 lines 35-60). It would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a

meter for counting quantities of a selected unit with the prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary

skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of providing counters based on e.g.,

packets in, packets out, bytes in, bytes out, and so on (Col. 6 lines 12-22).

v.   As per claim 191, Ivory and Farrell teach the invention substantially as

claimed above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of a meter.

Farrell teaches wherein said processor performs a meter resume

operation that is defined via said software and that instructs said processor to resume

counting after said processor has suspended counting (Col. 6 lines 12-22, Col. 28 lines

35-60). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate the use of a meter for counting quantities of a

selected unit with the prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done

so for the purpose of providing counters based on e.g., packets in, packets out, bytes in,

bytes out, and so on (Col. 6 lines 12-22).

w.   As per claim 192, Ivory discloses the invention substantially as claimed

above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of a mergeFlow operation.

Farrell teaches wherein said processor performs a mergeFlow operation which is defined via software, which adds a current process flow to at least one existing process flow, and which allocates joint resources of a computer system for said current process flow and said at least one existing process flow, wherein said first event is at least partially defined with said mergeFlow operation (Col. 16 lines 20-40, Col. 17 lines 1-19). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a mergeFlow operation with the prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of merging correlated flows (Col. 16 lines 20-40).

x.   As per claim 193 Ivory and Farrell teach the invention substantially as claimed above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of a mergeFlow operation.

Farrell teaches wherein said mergeFlow operation instructs said processor to assign a unique flow index number to said current process flow (Col. 16 lines 20-40, Col. 17 lines 1-19). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a mergeFlow operation with the prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of merging correlated flows (Col. 16 lines 20-40).

y.   As per claim 194, Ivory and Farrell teach the invention substantially as claimed above. However, Ivory fails to explicitly disclose the use of a mergeFlow operation.

Farrell teaches wherein said flow index number of said current process flow is different than a flow index number of said at least one existing process flow (Col. 16 lines 20-40, Col. 17 lines 1-19). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a mergeFlow operation with the prior art of Ivory. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of merging correlated flows (Col. 16 lines 20-40).

z.   As per claims 26-53, the claims are directed to method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims of rejected claims 166-194 and are thus rejected under the same rationale as outlined above.

aa.   As per claims 308-336, the claims are directed to computer implemented method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims of rejected claims 166-194 and are thus rejected under the same rationale as outlined above.

bb.   As per claims 445-473, the claims are directed to computer implemented method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims of rejected claims 166-194 and are thus rejected under the same rationale as outlined above.

Conclusion

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GRANT FORD whose telephone number is (571)272-8630. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5:30 Mon-Thurs alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Andrew Caldwell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2442

/G. F./
Examiner, Art Unit 2442